

Summary Minutes of the
Delta Protection Commission Meeting
Thursday, June 23, 2011

Port of Stockton
315 Fyffe Avenue
Rough and Ready Island
Stockton, California 95203

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Flag Salute.

Vice Chair Reagan called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m.

2. Welcome Commission Members.

Vice Chair Reagan welcomed Sandra Schubert to the meeting. Commissioner Schubert is currently the Undersecretary of the Department of Food and Agriculture.

3. Roll Call.

Present: Chair Nottoli; Commissioners Ferguson, Ferrara, Provenza (for McGowan), Piepho, Reagan, Ruhstaller, Nomellini (for Scriven), Schubert, Vick, and van Loben Sels.

Absent: Commissioners Bugsch, Cabaldon, and Eggman.

4. RECEIVE Presentation of Administrative Draft Economic Sustainability Plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Dr. Jeff Michael, University of the Pacific gave a presentation on the chapters in the first administrative draft of the ESP. Discussion ensued on the chapters with the Commission and the public. Discussion outline is attached.

5. Discuss the Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Plan, the Delta Reform Act (SB X7-1), and Possible Recommendations or Actions by the Commission Concerning Jurisdictional Issues Involving the Commission and the Council.

Commissioner Ferguson distributed a draft letter to be sent to the Resources Agency Secretary regarding the lack of Commission membership on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan management committee. He said transparency is the issue and that no one from the Delta has been asked to be on the committee. He asked that the Commission review the letter and make any comments necessary.

Commissioner Piepho suggested that “proposed large isolated conveyance facility” be added to paragraph 2 on page 2. She also suggested that a basis of time be added to the agricultural production figure.

Commissioner van Loben Sels asked that the dollar amount referenced in agricultural production be changed to include “value added” crops.

Commissioner Schubert asked that the number of jobs lost in the delta be added to the document.

Commissioner Vick suggested that the letter contain a dollar amount in the decrease of crops.

Vice Chair Regan moved approval of the letter; Commissioner Ferguson seconded. The motion was approved 8:0:1 by voice vote. (Commissioner Ferrara abstained).

6. Comments and Announcements From Members of the Commission and Staff.

There were no comments or announcements.

7. ADJOURN.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Delta Protection Commission
Administrative Draft - Economic Sustainability Plan
June 23, 2011

Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 5

- Author to identify how to achieve accurate cost benefit analysis (with respect to Delta) Pg. 8, Par 2
- Graph to show gross delta product (No BDCP, what would G.D.P. be?)
- Possible to provide separate Agriculture numbers (data)? Where lost and gained jobs? (Employment info)
- Focus is on PZ, can we add analysis on SZ in Chapter 3?
- Page 14- Question on ethnic breakdown
- Dismissing other studies (bias) – language in document is strong. Is tone the issue or the content?
- Will ESP undergo peer review?
- Challenge for DPC is to address policy that is based/created on debatable science, studies, etc. Is the ESP report in danger of being “marginalized?”
- Important to include Contra Costa County’s Ag 4 designation (reflecting all their work to preserve Ag in the county)
- Review of other work...keep in report? Be sensitive in wording.
- Critical analysis is important, if we have professionals evaluating the information (as part of ESP). Criticism or analysis needs a softer tone...
- Section on C.C. County may be a bit “light”
- List all three authors (give credit) on Delta Protection Act (and references to)
- Make sure all claims/disputes are supported

Chapter 4

- Page 45 - Better link of concurrent Army Corp efforts on levee vegetation
- Page 59 - Complete language with respect to cost sharing/funding
- Needs better summary of key findings (similar to other chapters)
- Confirm district names/numbers (reclamation, water, etc.)
- Issues to be addressed with any habitat (restoration) project
- Is data being produced from stations that are not relevant/applicable to the Delta analysis?
- Provide data to support conclusion that levees are in good condition, or do we just question statements that say they are not? (reference to support if so) (Pg. 36, 47, 62)
- Each chapter needs a summary section – similar to “cliff notes”

Public Comments (Chapters 1 through 5)

- #1- Negative impacts (past 80 years of projects/decisions/etc.) Port analysis in here?
- #2- More explanation on PZ/SZ (what cities/counties are in PZ/SZ). Better map needed
 - any maps/diagrams in referenced studies that is useful? ESP in Delta Plan? How much from ESP will be in Delta Plan?
- #3- Different economic analyses as part of other studies - what purpose?
- #4- As engineer he was happy to see review and analysis of past reports.

Chapter 6

- Water loss noted (evaporation vs. Ag use) (less water)
- Additional review needed in chapter to support data (opinions) and info in general
- Consistency of terms (“phraseology”) (needed throughout document – including crop comparisons, etc.)
- Will solutions be offered to impacts/challenges outlined in chapter?

Chapter 7

- Agriculture’s place in the state (needs to be structured like other chapters)
- Cite sources (ref. to CDFA report) throughout chapter and document
- Should you separate Ag tourism (put in Ag section?)
- Tables/figures need to be consistent (figures 7 and 10 given as example)
- More models needed, not just truck crops (field crops, animal Ag, etc.)
- Same years of data in chapter/document if possible (consistent)
- Listing of methodology (valuation, etc.)
- Explain indirect/direct
- Can new numbers be plugged in easily as data becomes available (most current is desired, e.g. 2009 data is used, and fuel costs are now higher)
- Review crop definitions (pasture/pastureland)
- Discussion (mention) of critical mass
- Water quality will have short and long term affect (at some point will damage crops to the point of the killing the plant/tree)
- All maps/tables should include C.C. County
- Crop loss will hit \$0 at some point when salinity goes to 200%
- Minimum water quality standards needed
- Make points that set the record straight
- “Bold out” conclusions (include all Ag)
- Add key findings

Chapter 8

- Trends with respect to fuel are important pieces of information (availability, etc.)
- Inclusion of marine repair
- Abandoned vessels (constraints and challenges)
- Two Gates project needs to be referenced in Chapter (ESP)
- Call out NHA (role, supporters, effort) and importance in ESP
- The Delta has few short-term use facilities for boats (need more)
- Page 141- bullet points don’t support mitigation

Public Comments (Chapters 6 through 8)

- #1 - Are Collinsville/Newport legacy communities?
- #2 – What is DPC’s role in promoting Recreation (NHA, TRNL, etc.)? Report out in August (from State Parks) will provide additional information.

Chapters 9, 10, and 11

- Show fuel lines (refineries)/ Rio Vista pressurized gas lines
- Rio Vista services (First Responders) are provided throughout south Delta

-Coast Guard and others providing service as well

Chapter 12

-Isleton data check is needed

-Is Knightsen a legacy community (LCs in legislation...if not referenced, why?)

Public Comments (Chapters 9 through 12)

No comments from the public.

Chapters 13 and 14

-Analysis of levee \$ is important and cost estimates (other #'s) need to be solid and something we can defend

-Suggest miles of levees is lower vs. list/show a number that is significantly lower

-Review salinity increases and impact on loss

Public Comments (Chapters 13 and 14)

#1- BDCP cost estimate for land acquisition has been footnoted to say it will be higher

-Additional impact on owners from habitat conservation (when funding runs out...who steps in to manage – e.g. invasive species management)

-Clarksburg pop. #'s (source?)

-What portion of Ag could be converted to creative re-uses? (What is the economic benefit?)